DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 787 JC 810 080

AUTHOR Rose, Thomas A.; Grafton, Clive L.
TITLE Critical Issues for the California Community Colleges in the 1980's.
INSTITUTION California Community and Junior Coll. Association, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 56p.; Includes Grafton's response to Rose's report presented at the Meeting of the California Community and Junior College Association (Los Angeles, CA, November 10, 1980). Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; College Curriculum; College Faculty; *College Role; *Community Colleges; Educational Facilities; Educational Finance; *Futures (of Society); Governance; Questionnaires; School Personnel; State Surveys; Student Personnel Services; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *California; *State Issues

ABSTRACT

A survey of 484 members of the California Community and Junior College Association (CCJCA) Delegate Assembly was conducted in Spring 1979 to: (1) identify the critical issues facing California public community colleges in the 1980's; (2) determine the different perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators with regard to the identified issues; and (3) compare the identified issues with those perceived as critical in the 1965 Peterson CCJCA study. The survey instrument listed 56 items in the areas of mission, instruction, student services, curriculum, staff, facilities, governance, and finance. Respondents were asked to evaluate the chance each item had of becoming a critical issue in the 1980's. Responses from 68 trustees, 102 administrators, 88 faculty members, and 43 students indicate that the ten most critical issues related to state agency role, tuition, finance parameters, adult basic education, collective bargaining, reduction in force procedures, student retention, enrollment projections, developmental education, and equalization of faculty salaries. The study report analyzes differences in the perceptions of the respondent groups and compares findings with the Peterson results. Clive Grafton's response to this report is appended, in which he notes, among other items, the low ranking of curricular items by respondents, their concern for immediate problems, and conflicts with the findings of regional or national studies. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197787

CRITICAL ISSUES
FOR THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
IN THE 1980'S:

August 1980

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sponsored by the
Research & Development Commission
California Community & Junior College Association

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas A. Rose

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Thomas A. Rose
Research Coordinator
Palomar College

With a Response by

Clive L. Grafton

JC 810 080

STUDY ABSTRACT

PURPOSE. The study was designed to determine: critical issues facing California public community colleges in the 1980's; differences in perception of these issues between trustees, administrators, faculty, and students of these colleges; differences in perception of these issues existing between college staff and students grouped by: college enrollment, geographic location, faculty collective bargaining status, and the form of district governance, single campus or multicampus; and changes in these issues since the precedent study by Peterson in 1965.

METHODOLOGY. A questionnaire, listing 56 critical issue items, was mailed to the 484 California Community & Junior College Association trustee, administrator, faculty, and student delegate assembly members. Sixty-two percent of the delegates responded. Lists of issues rank ordered by mean response were constructed for each delegate group, and a list of issues rank ordered for the delegate assembly as a whole was constructed by ordering the issues by the mean of the response means of the four delegate groups. Significant differences in group response, requiring a minimum difference of 0.5 questionnaire scale unit and statistical significance at the 0.05 level, were determined for all group comparisons.

FINDINGS. The ten issues in rank order perceived by the CCJCA delegate members as most likely to be critical in the 1980's included: State Level Roles, Tuition, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, Collective Bargaining, Reduction in Force Procedures, Student Retention, Enrollment Predictions, Developmental Education, and Equalization of Faculty Salaries.

Respondents grouped as trustees, administrators, faculty, or students were found to have significantly different perceptions on critical issues. The greatest number of such differences were noted between administrators and students with students placing more emphasis on student government and student medical services and less emphasis on employer-employee issues. Of the ten issues seen as most critical by each of the delegate groups, five issues: State Level Roles, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, Collective Bargaining, and Reduction in Force Procedures were common to the trustee, administrator and faculty lists. Students agreed with the first three of these issues but emphasized four other issues: Articulation with Four-Year Colleges, Flexible Calendar, Staff Performance Evaluation, and Traditional Roles, which were not among the first ten of the other three groups. Analysis of responses grouped by college enrollment and geographic location showed few significant differences. No significant differences in response were noted for responses grouped by collective bargaining status or district governance.

The five most critical issues in the 1965 Peterson study were: Effectiveness and Improvement of Instruction, Promotion and Dissemination of Junior College Research and Development, Dropouts, Evaluation of Instructional Offerings, and Financial Support, while the five most critical issues in this study were: State Level Roles, Tuition, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, and Collective Bargaining.

CONCLUSIONS. (1) The ten issues most likely to be critical for the California public community colleges for the 1980's, in order of importance, were: State Level Roles, Tuition, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, Collective Bargaining, Reduction in Force Procedures, Student Retention, Enrollment Predictions, Developmental Education, and Equalization of Faculty Salaries. (2) Community college trustees, administrators, and faculty had similar perceptions regarding future critical issues. (3) Community college students tended to identify more issues as crucial which related to educational delivery and to student services. (4) College enrollment and college location had little effect on issue perception. (5) Faculty collective bargaining status and district governance form had no significant effect on issue perception. (6) A general shift in critical issues has occurred between 1965 and 1979 from the areas of Student Services and Curriculum to those of Finance and Mission.

RECOMMENDATIONS. (1) The California Postsecondary Education Commission should investigate the future impact of one issue: Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges, and Community Colleges. (2) The Board of Governors of California Community Colleges should investigate the future impact of eight issues: State Level Roles, Tuition, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, Enrollment Predictions, Equalization of Faculty Salaries, Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student, and Interdistrict Student Flow. (3) The California community college districts, operating individually or jointly through CCJCA, should investigate the future impact of nine issues: Collective Bargaining, Reduction in Force Procedures, Student Retention, Developmental Education, Part-Time Faculty, Staff Performance Evaluation, Articulation with Four-Year Colleges, Flexible Calendar, and Traditional Roles.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Public community colleges in California are faced now, as perhaps never before, with pressures forcing a reassessment of their role, their governance, and their financing. Major factors in this scenario have included the high rate of financial inflation in the late 1970's and the passage of a number of items of landmark legislation in California in the late 1960's and in the 1970's.

The ten year period from 1968 to 1978 was a period of consistent growth and increasing complexity for the California public community colleges. The California colleges grew from a total credit enrollment of 601,000 students in 1968 to an enrollment of 1,073,000 students in 1978. The number of individual campuses grew from 70 to 107 and the number of faculty employed by these campuses increased from 22,600 to 37,700 as the colleges increased both in number and in size.

During this period enrollments were greatly expanded by the attendance of veterans of the Korean and Vietnamese wars. Vocational education offerings increased rapidly, and a number of new programs became standard elements of the community college scene including multicultural programs, work experience programs and programs for older adults. In the same period financial aid to students in public California community colleges increased substantially, bringing many students to the community college who previously had been financially excluded.

Since 1968 major items of legislation passed in California with fundamental effect on the community colleges have:

- established the California Community College Board of Governors,
- established the California Postsecondary Education Commission,
- mandated faculty evaluation through the Stull Bill, and
- instituted collective bargaining in the colleges through the Rodda Bill.

Finally, the passage in June 1978 of Proposition 13 with its drastic reduction in California property tax revenue, in one action, brought an end to an era of rapid community college development in California, placed the colleges in a financial and philosophic limbo, and moved the colleges into a new, uncertain watershed.

As we enter the decade of the 1980's it is of major importance for the California community colleges to identify those issues which will be pivotal in determining their roles, their financing and their governance.

The current study had its origin in a 1978 meeting of the California Community & Junior College Association (CCJCA) Research and Development Commission in which it was resolved to foster a repetition of a study of California community college issues done in 1965 under the auspices of the then California Junior College Association.

The Peterson Study

Peterson (1965) directed the earlier study whose purpose was to identify critical problems of the California community colleges, especially those related to instruction, counseling and guidance, and vocational education, and also to determine means of solving these problems.

A letter was sent to each California community college president with a list of 12 sample critical problems. Recipients were asked to eliminate items perceived as nonessential and to add essential problems. From the issues generated by the original mailing, a condensed list was submitted to an Advisory Committee which developed a final ranked listing of 26 most critical issues. Of this listing the ten most important issues in rank order, with two ties, were:

1. Effectiveness and improvement of instruction,
2. Promotion and dissemination of junior college research and development,
3. Dropouts,
4. Evaluation of instructional offerings,
5. Financial support,
6. Student characteristics,
7. Preparation of instructors,
7. Realistic counseling,
9. Faculty loads, and
9. Two-year and four-year college articulation.

The current study has some similarities with the original Peterson study and some substantial differences. Similarities include its dealing with critical issues of the California community and junior colleges and the fact that the population surveyed was drawn from within the membership of the CCJCA. The differences include, that:

1. The investigation was focused broadly on the perceptions of trustees, administrators, faculty and students,
2. A major part of the analysis dealt with possible differences in perceptions of these groups,
3. The final ranking of issues was done by a mathematical ranking of the results of the questionnaire survey, and
4. The end product of the survey was intended as a list of issues defined with enough clarity and specificity to be of immediate use to CCJCA or the individual college districts.

Design of the Study

This investigation was designed to identify crucial issues facing the public community colleges of California in the 1980's and to provide a detailed analysis of the perceptions of these issues held by governing board trustees, administrators, faculty and students of these colleges.

Three specific questions were pursued.

1. What are the critical issues facing California public community colleges in the 1980's as seen by trustees, administrators, faculty and students of these colleges?

2. What differences in perception of these issues exist between the trustees, the administrators, the faculty and the students of these colleges?

3. What differences in perception of these issues exist between the respondents grouped by:

    a) the size of the enrollment of the respondent's college,
    b) the geographic location, north and south, of the respondent's college district,
    c) the status of faculty collective bargaining in the respondent's college district, and
    d) the form of governance, single campus or multicampus, in the respondent's college district.

Critical issues were intended to include topics anticipated as major subjects of discussion in State level educational forums--the Legislature, the Postsecondary Education Commission, the Board of Governors, the State Academic Senate or the California Community and Junior College Association--and which suggested major change in the goal, function or practice of the California community colleges. Because of the inclusion of student respondents with a more local focus, critical issues were also taken to include problems which, while not crucial across the State, were felt to embody the need for important change at the local level.

The study was deferred during the 1977-1978 academic year because of the imminence of the State referendum on Proposition 13 with its possible impact on community college finance, and was postponed after the passage of Proposition 13 until the impacts of its passage were better defined.

The study was initiated and its data gathered during the spring of 1979.

STUDY METHOD

Survey Population

The purpose of this study was to examine the impressions on critical issues of the staffs and students of the California community colleges. Thus, conducting the survey in conjunction with CCJCA was advantageous in that the CCJCA Delegate Assembly, consisting of trustees, administrators, faculty, and students from these colleges, offered an easily identified and representative sample of this target population.

The California public community colleges in the spring semester of 1979 included 107 colleges governed by 70 community college districts which were, in turn, under the guidance of the State Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges. Of these 70 community college districts, 51 were districts responsible for the administration of one college only. The other 19 districts administered to the needs of multicampus districts each dealing with from two to four individual colleges with the exception of the Los Angeles Community College District which covers nine separate campuses.

The CCJCA Delegate Assembly includes, in principle, one trustee, one administrator, one faculty member and one student from each of the 107 colleges and from each of the 19 multicampus district offices. Several such positions were vacant in 1979 so that the number of delegates surveyed in the study was reduced to 484.

Delegates are selected by the individual colleges and districts, usually including the chairman of the district board of trustees, the president of the college or the superintendent of the district, if a multicampus district, the president of the faculty association or senate, and the president of the student government.

Survey Method

The method employed in this study was that of a mailed questionnaire.

Instrument Development

A form of the questionnaire was developed around the major headings of: Mission, Instruction, Student Services, Curriculum, Staff, Facilities, Governance, and Finance. Items were drawn from the original Peterson study (1965), from the 1979 five year plan of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (Note 1), from the 1977 five year plan of the Board of Governors for California Community Colleges (Note 2), from precedent studies of community college issues, from a number of general studies of community colleges and from articles in the educational periodicals relative to community colleges.

A Likert-type scale of answers was developed which solicited the respondent's perception of the chance of a particular item being a critical issue in the 1980's.

An Advisory Panel of 20 individuals: 5 trustees, 5 administrators, 5 faculty, and 5 students were selected based on the advice of Ernest H. Berg, then Assistant Director of CCJCA. A number of these individuals were members of the Delegate Assembly but many were selected from the membership of the various special CCJCA commissions based on their level of activity and involvement.

A letter of invitation was mailed to each prospective member of the Advisory Panel with a copy of the preliminary questionnaire. They were requested to score the questionnaires as a final respondent would and to add, delete, or modify items as they felt appropriate. Of the 20 prospective Panel members, 16 provided their insights and constituted the final Advisory Panel (Appendix A).

The comments of the Advisory Panel were of extreme value. Many questionnaire items were changed, a better preamble to the questionnaire was developed and an improved definition of a critical issue was added.

The final questionnaire (Appendix B) included 56 items in a four-page form.

Instrument Transmittal

Questionnaire mailing was timed for the latter part of the Spring 1979 semester to leave the greatest possible adjustment time for the accommodations of the California community colleges to the passage of Proposition 13 and its disruption of community college finance in the State. A total of 484 questionnaires were mailed to members of the Delegate Assembly on May 15, 1979. A first follow-up letter was mailed May 23rd, a second follow-up letter on May 30th, and a third, and final, follow-up letter was mailed June 8th.

Collection of Collateral Data

Collateral information collected for analysis in this study included the size of Fall 1978 enrollment of each of the California community colleges, its district's north-south geographic location in the State, its district's involvement in faculty collective bargaining, and its district's governance, whether a multicampus or a single campus district.

Data for college enrollments was drawn from the State Chancellor's Office Summary of Fall 1978 Community College Enrollments for credit, noncredit, and total enrollments. Six categories of college total enrollment sizes were coded as shown in the categories below:

1. 0 to 5,999 students,
2. 6,000 to 11,999 students,
3. 12,000 to 17,999 students,
4. 18,000 to 23,999 students,
5. 24,000 to 29,999 students, and
6. 30,000 to 36,000 students.

Districts were coded by north-south geographic location in the State into four regions described as North, North Central, South Central, and South. These regions were divided by east-west lines through major geographic features of the State as noted below:

1. North: north of an east-west line through Lake Tahoe.

2. North Central: between east-west lines through Lake Tahoe and through Monterey Bay.

3. South Central: between east-west lines through Monterey Bay and through the Tehachapi Mountains.

4. South: south of an east-west line through the Tehachapi Mountains.

These divisions divided the State into areas with some generally understood geographic identities. The southern section, in particular, included that portion of California typically described as Southern California.

Information regarding the districts' collective bargaining status was difficult to obtain, and a separate questionnaire was sent to each of the 70 district offices to determine the existence of faculty collective bargaining contracts at each of the districts in the spring of 1979. Thus, two categories of district were defined: those having faculty collective bargaining contracts in the spring of 1979 and those not having such contracts.

The governance form of each of the college districts was determined from the community college directory published by the California State Chancellor's Office for the academic year 1978-1979 as being either single campus or multi-campus.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire data were analyzed through use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Nie, et al (1970) at the Computer Center of the University of California at San Diego.

Data analysis progressed through a number of steps which are identified below for analysis by respondent group, but are representative of analysis by: college enrollment, district geographic location, district collective bargaining status, and district governance.

1. Returned questionnaires were cardpunched, identifying the respondent as a trustee, administrator, faculty member, or student. Each "excellent" issue response was registered as a 5 count, each "good" response as a 4 count, etc.

2. Responses to questionnaire issues were tabulated and mean responses determined for each issue for respondents in each of the four delegate groups: trustee, administrator, faculty, and student.

3. Histograms of response distributions were produced for each issue within each delegate group to judge response distribution normality. Frequent skewing of response distributions precluded the use of the t-test as a measure of the statistical significance of difference between the responses of the four delegate groups.

4. Contingency tables were developed comparing the response distributions for each issue between the four delegate groups on a pair-wise basis.

5. Lists of issues rank ordered by mean response were constructed for each delegate group.

6. A list of issues, rank ordered for the Delegate Assembly as a whole, was constructed by ordering the issues by the mean of the response means of the four delegate groups. This method was used to ensure that contributions of the different delegate groups to this list were not influenced by differing questionnaire return rates.

7. A count of the frequency of the inclusion of issues in each issue category, i.e., Mission, Instruction, Student Services, etc., was made for the 15 top ranked issues of each delegate group to determine the relative level of perceived importance of these eight issue categories. An ordered list of issue categories was produced, ranked by level of perceived importance, for each delegate group and for all delegate groups combined.

8. Differences between the responses of the four delegate groups to each issue were investigated by tabulating the differences between their mean responses on a pair-wise basis. Significant differences between delegate group responses were defined to require both a minimum substantive difference and a minimum statistically significant difference. The minimum substantive difference was taken as 0.5 questionnaire response scale unit, and the minimum statistical difference was taken as requiring statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

9. Chi-square tests were applied to the 2x5 contingency tables of Step 4, to determine levels of statistical difference. Where contingency table cell expected frequencies fell below the normal minimum of 5, the tables were appropriately recombined and chi-square recomputed (Weiss, 1968).

10. A tabulation was developed which displayed each issue for which one or more pairs of delegate groups registered significant differences in perception as defined above.

Answers to the three major study questions developed directly from the analytical steps described above.

STUDY RESULTS

Questionnaire Response

Of 484 questionnaires mailed to very nearly equal numbers of trustees, administrators, faculty and students, 301 were returned, producing a final response rate of 62%. In the four delegate groups 68 trustees, 102 administrators, 88 faculty and 43 students responded to the questionnaire.

Issue Perceptions: The Delegate Groups Combined

The study questionnaire listed 56 issue items in eight issue categories: Mission, Instruction, Student Services, Curriculum, Staff, Facilities, Governance, and Finance. Mean responses for each issue are shown in Appendix C for each delegate group and for all delegate groups combined. A listing of all 56 issues, ranked by mean response score, is shown in Appendix D for each delegate group and for all delegate groups combined.

Table 1 is a ranked and detailed listing of the 25 most critical issues representing the perceptions of the four delegate groups combined. This ranking was based on the mean of the individual mean responses of the four delegate groups for each issue so that the opinions of the groups were evenly weighted.

Table 2 lists the first 15 issues and indicates the category each issue fell within in the survey questionnaire.

Of these 15 most critical issues, Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the delegate groups combined placed most emphasis on three categories: Staff, Finance, and Mission, these categories including 11 of the 15 top issues. By comparison, no items from the Curriculum and Facilities categories were included.

Issue Perceptions: Current Study Results Compared to Peterson Study Results

Displayed in Table 5 is a comparison of the rank ordered listing of the 15 most critical issues for California community colleges as determined by Peterson in 1965 and by this study 14 years later.

The Peterson study issues can be grouped according to the issue categories of the current study and ranked by issue category, as shown in Tables 6 and 7. A comparison of issue category rankings in 1965 and in 1979, Tables 7 and 4, shows that:

a) Staff issues were ranked high, both in 1965 and now,

b) Finance and Mission, ranked relatively low in 1965, are among the most important issue areas now,

c) Student Services and Curriculum, ranked relatively high in 1965, are ranked less important now,

d) Governance and Instruction were ranked of intermediate importance in both studies,

e) Facilities was ranked of relatively low importance in both studies.

Twenty-Five
Most Critical Issues
Rank Ordered by All Delegate Groups Combined

1. State Level Roles - Resolve the appropriate division of responsibilities between the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the State Department of Finance, the State Board of Governors, and the local Governing Boards in the governance of the community colleges.

2. Tuition - Consider the advantages and disadvantages of some form of student tuition for future community college support.

3. Finance Parameters - Determine the likely effects of State funding systems which key apportionments to measured volumes of student support services as well as instructional services and to student credit hours rather than contact hours.

4. Adult Basic Skills Education - Reassess the current division of responsibilities between the community colleges and the high schools in teaching basic adult survival skills to better define community college responsibilities.

5. Collective Bargaining - Determine the effects of collective bargaining in the community colleges and consider desired changes in its scope or operation.

6. Reduction in Force Procedures - Clarify current state and local policies dealing with reducing staff under conditions of diminished funding or enrollments and consider their long term effects on campus and staff.

7. Student Retention - Evaluate current programs aimed at improving student retention and consider the desirability of expanding and improving these activities.

8. Enrollment Predictions - Evaluate predictions of reduced numbers of traditional, young community college students in the 1980's in terms of the impact of these predictions on needed staff and facilities in the future and on the community college clientele in the eighties.

9. Developmental Education - Determine the appropriate emphasis on basic reading, writing and mathematical instruction in the overall community college program.

10. Equalization of Faculty Salaries - Assess the effects of a Statewide faculty salary schedule as a possible result of departing from property tax financing.

11. Equalization of Instructional Costs Per Student - Assess the effects of a leveling of educational expenditures per student among the colleges as a possible result of reduced support from property taxes.

12. Interdistrict Student Flow - Analyze the permit, free flow and "nearest college" options in controlling interdistrict student flows to determine which system acts best to meet both student and college needs.

13. Part-Time Faculty - Reassess the role of part-time faculty, determine their appropriate weight in collective bargaining issues and consider their appropriate compensation.

14. Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges, and Community Colleges - Determine, in the event of reduced numbers of high school graduates in the 1980's, the best scheme for division of such students between the three segments of public postsecondary education in California.

15. Staff Performance Evaluation - Evaluate the reality of staff evaluation systems in their differentiating efficient and inefficient performance and consider any needed revisions of current practice.

16. Articulation with Four-Year Colleges - Develop improved means of ensuring that the community college curriculum relates efficiently with that of neighboring four-year colleges.

17. Categorical Funded Programs - Examine the extent of categorically funded community college programs and the degree to which such programs fulfill or distort the colleges' primary mission.

18. Faculty Load - Evaluate current systems for defining community college faculty load and determine the fairness and effectiveness of these systems.

19. Traditional Roles - Reassess the traditional community college roles of transfer education, general education and occupational education in terms of their relevance to today's community.

20. Requirements for Credit Classification - Analyze the increasingly restrictive requirements for credit classification of community college programs to determine a set of definitions which best deals with the community college mission and its clientele.

21. Program Evaluation - Develop a system of program evaluation which assures that educational programs fulfill needed goals when instituted and continue to fulfill these goals in succeeding years.

22. Personal Enrichment Education - Examine community needs for noncredit, personal enrichment classes and the means, tuition or otherwise, of funding such classes.

23. Outreach and Recruitment - Evaluate current outreach and recruitment programs and consider whether these activities should be changed in the present period of falling enrollment.

24. Flexible Calendar - Consider adoption of a flexible academic calendar allowing shorter instruction periods than the classical semester, flexible scheduling of educational programs, and completion of the first period before the Christmas break.

25. Community Services - Examine the colleges' current role as community cultural centers with programs in art, music and drama, and determine whether this role should be expanded or diminished.

Table 2

Fifteen Most Critical Issues
for California Community Colleges
in the 1980's in Rank Order

Rank Number	Issue Title	Questionnaire Issue Category
1	State Level Roles	Governance
2	Tuition	Finance
3	Finance Parameters	Finance
4	Adult Basic Skills Education	Mission
5	Collective Bargaining	Staff
6	Reduction in Force Procedures	Staff
7	Student Retention	Student Services
8	Enrollment Predictions	Instruction
9	Developmental Education	Mission
10	Equalization of Faculty Salaries	Finance
11	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student	Finance
12	Interdistrict Student Flow	Governance
13	Part-Time Faculty	Staff
14	Channeling of High School Graduates	Mission
15	Staff Performance Evaluation	Staff

Table 3

Number of Issues in Each Issue Category
Included in 15 Most Critical Issues
as Ranked by All Delegate Groups Combined

Issue Category	No. of Issues
Mission	3
Instruction	1
Student Services	1
Curriculum	0
Staff	4
Facilities	0
Governance	2
Finance	4

Table 4

Issue Categories Ranked in Importance
for All Delegate Groups Combined
by Number of Inclusions of 15 Most Critical Issues

Rank	Issue Category
1	Staff Finance
2	Mission
3	Governance
4	Instruction Student Services
5	Curriculum Facilities

Table 5

Comparison of Results of
1965 & 1979 Critical Issues Studies

Rank	Peterson Study (1965)	Current Study (1979)
1	Effectiveness & improvement of instruction	State level roles
2	Promotion & dissemination of junior college research & development	Tuition
3	Dropouts	Finance parameters
4	Evaluation of instructional offerings	Adult basic skills education
5	Financial support	Collective bargaining
6	Student characteristics	Reduction in force procedures
7	*Preparation of instructors	Student retention
8	*Realistic counseling	Enrollment predictions
9	#Faculty loads	Developmental education
10	#Two-year & four-year college articulation	Equalization of faculty salaries
11	Occupational training needed	Equalization of instructional costs
12	Instructor evaluation	Interdistrict student flow
13	Scholastic standards	Part-time faculty
14	Governance of junior colleges	Channeling of high school graduates
15	Philosophy & role of the junior college	Staff performance evaluation

(Rank ties = *, #)

Table 6

Number of First 15 Peterson Study Issues
in Each of the Issue Categories
of the Current Study

Issue Category	Issue Item	No. of Issues in Category
Mission	Philosophy & role of the junior college	1
Instruction	Effectiveness & improvement of instruction Scholastic standards	2
Student Services	Dropouts Student characteristics Realistic counseling	3
Curriculum	Evaluation of instructional offerings Two-year & four-year college articulation Occupational training needed	3
Staff	Preparation of instructors Faculty loads Instructor evaluation	3
Facilities	None	0
Governance	Promotion & dissemination of research & development Governance of junior colleges	2
Finance	Financial support	1

Table 7

Issue Categories Ranked in Importance
for Peterson Study
by Number of Inclusions of 15 Most Critical Issues

Rank	Issue Category
1	Student Services Curriculum Staff
2	Instruction Governance
3	Mission Finance
4	Facilities

Thus, between 1965 and 1979 two areas, Finance and Mission, have substantially increased in perceived importance while two other areas, Student Services and Curriculum, have diminished in perceived importance.

A more general study of Table 5's comparison of issues critical in 1965 and in 1979 produces the following observations:

a) A number of issues of major importance in 1965 are still of critical interest today, including:

   Dropouts (Student retention)

   Financial support (Tuition, Finance parameters)

   Instructor evaluation (Staff performance evaluation)

   Governance of junior colleges (State level roles).

b) A number of issues which are important today were unknown in 1965, having sprung from changing legislative, societal or demographic environments. These include:

   Finance parameters,

   Collective bargaining,

   Reduction in force procedures,

   Enrollment predictions,

   Equalization of faculty salaries,

   Equalization of instructional costs,

   Channeling of high school graduates.

The appearance is that some issues have remained important over the 14 year period studied, that other issues have developed from economic and societal change and, finally, that the California community college environment is steadily becoming more complex.

Issue Perceptions: The Delegate Groups Compared

Differences in the perceptions of the four delegate groups were analyzed by: (1) producing orderings of the issues for each group ranked by group mean response, (2) comparing the distribution of top issues among issue categories, and (3) identifying issues for which two or more pairs of delegate groups showed mean response differences larger than 0.5 questionnaire scale interval with a statistical significance at or above the 0.05 probability level.

A first comparison of the perceptions of the four delegate groups is provided by Tables 8 through 11, which provide rank ordered lists of the first 25 issues for each group and indicate the issue category from which each issue was drawn in the survey questionnaire.

Table 8

Twenty-Five Most Critical Issues
as Rank Ordered by Trustee Group

Rank Number	Issue Title	Questionnaire Issue Category
1	State Level Roles	Governance
2	Tuition	Finance
3	Collective Bargaining	Staff
4	Adult Basic Skills Education	Mission
5	Reduction in Force Procedures	Staff
6	Enrollment Predictions	Instruction
7	Part-Time Faculty	Staff
8	Finance Parameters	Finance
9	Faculty Load	Staff
10	Interdistrict Student Flow	Governance
11	Categorical Funded Programs	Finance
12	Student Retention	Student Services
13	*Staff Performance Evaluation	Staff
	*Equalization of Faculty Salaries	Finance
15	Personal Enrichment Education	Mission
16	Public Employment Relations Board	Governance
17	*Developmental Education	Mission
	*Program Evaluation	Curriculum
19	Community College Education Code	Governance
20	Channeling of High School Graduates	Mission
21	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student	Finance
22	Control of Campus Construction	Finance
23	Traditional Roles	Mission
24	Requirements for Credit Classifications	Curriculum
25	Intercollegiate Athletics	Mission

*Rank Order Ties.

Table 9

Twenty-Five Most Critical Issues
as Rank Ordered by Administrator Group

Rank Number	Issue Title	Questionnaire Issue Category
1	State Level Roles	Governance
2	Finance Parameters	Finance
3	Student Retention	Student Services
4	Reduction In Force Procedures	Staff
5	Adult Basic Skills Education	Mission
6	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student	Finance
7	Collective Bargaining	Staff
8	Equalization of Faculty Salaries	Finance
9	Developmental Education	Mission
10	Interdistrict Student Flow	Governance
11	Enrollment Predictions	Instruction
12	Tuition	Finance
13	Part-Time Faculty	Staff
14	Faculty Load	Staff
15	Channeling of High School Graduates	Mission
16	Public Employment Relations Board	Governance
17	Staff Performance Evaluation	Staff
18	Categorical Funded Programs	Finance
19	Program Evaluation	Curriculum
20	Control of Campus Construction	Finance
21	Educational Master Plans	Curriculum
22	Requirements for Credit Classifications	Curriculum
23	Faculty Senates	Governance
24	Outreach & Recruitment	Student Services
25	Personal Enrichment Education	Mission

Table 10

Twenty-Five Most Critical Issues
as Rank Ordered by Faculty Group

Rank Number	Issue Title	Questionnaire Issue Category
1	State Level Roles	Governance
2	Adult Basic Skills Education	Mission
3	Developmental Education	Mission
4	Tuition	Finance
5	Channeling of High School Graduates	Mission
6	Reduction in Force Procedures	Staff
7	Finance Parameters	Finance
8	Collective Bargaining	Staff
9	*Enrollment Predictions	Instruction
	*Equalization of Faculty Salaries	Finance
11	Student Retention	Student Services
12	Traditional Roles	Mission
13	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student	Finance
14	Articulation with Four-Year Colleges	Curriculum
15	Requirements for Credit Classification	Curriculum
16	Flexible Calendar	Instruction
17	Categorical Funded Programs	Finance
18	Faculty Load	Staff
19	Part-Time Faculty	Staff
20	Staff Performance Evaluation	Staff
21	Faculty Senates	Governance
22	Counseling Program	Student Services
23	Interdistrict Student Flow	Governance
24	Public Employment Relations Board	Governance
25	Program Evaluation	Curriculum

*Rank Order Ties.

Table 11

Twenty-Five Most Critical Issues
as Rank Ordered by Student Group

Rank Number	Issue Title	Questionnaire Issue Category
1	Tuition	Finance
2	State Level Roles	Governance
3	Finance Parameters	Finance
4	Articulation with Four-Year Colleges	Curriculum
5	Flexible Calendar	Instruction
6	Interdistrict Student Flow	Governance
7	Staff Performance Evaluation	Staff
8	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student	Finance
9	*Adult Basic Skills Education	Mission
	*Traditional Roles	Mission
11	Student Retention	Student Services
12	Enrollment Predictions	Instruction
13	*Collective Bargaining	Staff
	*Reduction in Force Procedures	Staff
15	Developmental Education	Mission
16	Outreach & Recruitment	Student Services
17	Community College Education Code	Governance
18	Instruction, Student Services Roles	Mission
19	Requirements for Credit Classifications	Curriculum
20	Categorical Funded Programs	Finance
21	Equalization of Faculty Salaries	Finance
22	Community Services	Mission
23	Personal Enrichment Education	Mission
24	*Program Evaluation	Curriculum
	*Educational Master Plans	Curriculum

*Rank Order Ties.

Table 12 shows the distribution of the first 15 issues for the four groups over the questionnaire issue categories, and Table 13 ranks these categories in importance for the four delegate groups.

Table 12

Number of Issues in Each Issue Category Included in the Fifteen Most Critical Issues as Ranked by Each Delegate Group

Issue Category	Delegate Group			
	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students
Mission	2	3	4	3
Instruction	1	1	1	2
Student Services	1	1	1	1
Curriculum	0	0	2	1
Staff	5	4	2	3
Facilities	0	0	0	0
Governance	2	2	1	2
Finance	4	4	4	3

Staff and Finance are seen to be the most critical categories as seen by trustees and administrators, Finance and Mission the most critical by faculty, and Finance, Staff and Mission the most critical by students.

All four groups indicated Facilities to be a category unlikely to focus major attention in the 1980's.

Table 13

Issue Categories Ranked in Importance for Each Delegate Group by Number of Inclusions of 15 Most Critical Issues

Rank	Delegate Group			
	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students
1	Staff	Staff Finance	Mission Finance	Mission Staff Finance
2	Finance	Mission	Curriculum Staff	Instruction Governance
3	Mission Governance	Governance	Instruction Student Services Governance	Stu.Services Curriculum
4	Instruction Student Services	Instruction Student Services	Facilities	Facilities
5	Curriculum Facilities	Curriculum Facilities		

A comparison of delegate group emphasis on individual issues, drawn from Tables 8 through 11, shows that State Level Roles, Finance Parameters, and Adult Basic Skills Education were included in the first 10 issues of all four groups.

Table 14 indicates issues, beyond the 3 noted above, which were common to the first 10 issues in each of the possible combinations of three delegate groups.

Table 14

Issues Common to Combinations of 3 Delegate Groups but not Common to All 4 Delegate Groups

Delegate Groups	Common Issues
Trustee, Administrator, Faculty	Collective Bargaining Reduction in Force Procedures
Trustee, Administrator, Student	Interdistrict Student Flow
Trustee, Faculty, Student	Tuition
Administrator, Faculty, Student	None

Issues included in the first 10 items of one delegate group and absent in the first 10 items of the other three groups are noted in Table 15.

Table 15

Issues Included in First 10 Issues of One Delegate Group But Absent from First 10 Issues of the Other 3 Delegate Groups

Delegate Group	Unique Issues
Trustee	Part-Time Faculty Faculty Load
Administrator	Student Retention
Faculty	Channeling High School Graduates
Students	Articulation w/4 Yr. Colleges Flexible Calendar Staff Performance Evaluation Traditional Roles

Trustees, administrators, and faculty thus concurred in five of their first 10 issues: (1) State Level Roles, (2) Finance Parameters, (3) Adult Basic Skills Education, (4) Collective Bargaining, and (5) Reduction in Force Procedures.

Students agreed with three of these five issues: (1) State Level Roles, (2) Finance Parameters, and (3) Adult Basic Skills Education.

Students also emphasized four issues not included in any of the first 10 issues of the other three delegate groups: (1) Articulation with Four-Year Colleges, (2) Flexible Calendar, (3) Staff Performance Evaluation, and (4) Traditional Roles.

Thus, trustees, administrators, and faculty are seen as having similar perceptions regarding issues with an emphasis on administrative problems. Students represented a substantially different viewpoint which had a basic focus on the issues of educational delivery.

Examination of difference in perception between delegate groups led, finally, to a search for substantive differences between the response means of pairs of delegate groups. Table 16 displays all issues for which: (1) the mean response scores of any two delegate groups differed by more than 0.5 questionnaire scale unit, and (2) the difference was statistically significant at the 0.05 level or higher.

Data characteristics precluded use of the t-test, and the chi-square test was used as the criteria of statistical significance.

Table 16 indicates that there were 34 such response differences with greatest number, 10, occurring between administrators and students, the least number, 3, occurring between both trustee-faculty and administrator-faculty pairs, and intermediate numbers of differences occurring between trustee-administrator, trustee-student, and faculty-student pairs.

The data of Table 16 is converted in Table 17 to a tabulation showing, for each delegate group, those issues which it felt had a higher probability of being critical than did a second delegate group. Thus, Table 17 shows that administrators felt that 17 issues were more critical than did other delegate groups; students, 8 issues; trustees, 5 issues; and faculty, 4 issues.

Analysis of Table 17 indicates that students apparently placed more emphasis on student government and medical services than did the other delegate groups. Also students' remoteness from campus collective bargaining apparently led them to low appraisals of the importance of Collective Bargaining and the Public Employee Relations Board.

Finally, administrative delegates generally placed more importance on managerial issues than did other delegate groups, i.e., Educational Follow-up Programs, Student Retention, Educational Master Plans, Equalization of Faculty Salaries, and Interdistrict Student Flow.

Table 16

Differences in Issue Perception Between Paired Delegate Groups Exceeding 0.5 Scale Unit and Significant at 0.05

Issue Category	Issue Description	Differences Between Group Mean Response Scores --Taken in Order Shown					
		Trustee-Admin.	Trustee-Faculty	Trustee-Student	Admin.-Faculty	Admin.-Student	Faculty-Student
Mission	Adult Basic Skills Education					.519**	
	Developmental Education	-.584***	-.524**				
	Channeling High School Graduates						.673**
Instruction	Self-Paced Learning					.511***	
	Educational Follow-up Programs	-.567**			.577**		
	Flexible Calendar		-.535*	-.760***			
Student Services	Student Government			-.536*		-.792***	-.911***
	Student Medical Services			-.586*		-.701***	-.909***
	Student Retention	-.647***				.553***	
Curriculum	Articulation w/4-Yr. Colleges			-.698**			
	Educational Master Plans	-.578**			.519*		
Staff	Faculty Load			.531*			
	Collective Bargaining			.524*			
	Part-Time Faculty					.591**	
	Reduction in Force Procedures					.618**	
Facilities	Transportation & Parking		.606*				
Governance	State Level Roles					.645***	
	Interdistrict Student Flow				.565**		
	Public Employment Relations Board			.892***		1.075***	.778*
Finance	Equalization of Faculty Salaries	-.547**				.618**	
	Finance Parameters	-.599***					
	Equalization of Instruc. Costs	.796***					
Number Differences, Paired Groups		7	3	7	3	10	4

Note: Statistical significance: * Significant at the .05 level.
** Significant at the .01 level.
*** Significant at the .001 level.

Table 17

Significant Differences in Issue Perception
Between Paired Delegate Groups

Perceived probability as a critical issue		
Higher Probability	Lower Probability	Issue Description
Trustees	Administrators	Equalization of instructional costs
	Faculty	Transportation & parking
	Students	Faculty load
		Collective bargaining
		Public Employee Relations Board
Administrators	Trustees	Developmental education
		Educational follow-up programs
		Student retention
		Educational master plans
		Equalization of faculty salaries
		Finance parameters
	Faculty	Educational follow-up programs
		Educational master plans
		Interdistrict student flow
	Students	Adult basic skills education
		Self-paced learning
		Student retention
		Part-time faculty
		Reduction in force procedures
		State level roles
		Public Employee Relations Board
		Equalization of faculty salaries
Faculty	Trustees	Developmental education
		Flexible calendar
	Administrators	None
	Students	Channeling of high school graduates
		Public Employee Relations Board
Students	Trustees	Flexible calendar
		Student government
		Student medical services
		Articulation with 4-year colleges
	Administrators	Student government
		Student medical services
	Faculty	Student government
		Student medical services

Influence of College Enrollment Size

The third study question included an inquiry into whether significant differences existed between the perceptions of critical issues of respondents based upon the enrollments of their colleges.

Respondents were grouped by their college total enrollment in Fall 1979 into four categories: (1) those from colleges with enrollments from 0 to 5,999 students, (2) those from colleges with enrollments from 6,000 to 11,999, (3) those from colleges with enrollments from 12,000 to 17,999, and (4) those from colleges with enrollments of 18,000 or over. Because trustees and administrators from multicampus district offices had no identifiable source college and because faculty and students representing such offices were difficult to trace back to specific colleges, all such delegates were excluded from this analysis. The number of respondents in the four categories were, respectively: (1) 80, (2) 74, (3) 41, and (4) 44.

Differences in the perceptions of delegates from the four enrollment groups were analyzed by identifying issues for which two or more pairs of delegate groups showed mean response differences larger than 0.5 questionnaire scale interval with a statistical significance at or above the 0.05 probability level.

Table 18 indicates the three significant differences in perception noted between delegates grouped by college enrollment size. Delegates from colleges with 6,000 to 12,000 students enrolled felt that Educational Follow-up Programs would be more likely to become a critical issue than did delegates from colleges enrolling 18,000 students or more. Likewise, delegates from colleges with 6,000 to 12,000 students felt that two issues, Faculty Senates and District-College Administration, were more likely to become critical issues than did delegates from colleges enrolling 12,000 to 18,000 students.

Some evidence was, thus, found that significant differences in perceptions did exist based upon the sizes of delegates' college enrollment, but too few differences were observed to allow any conclusions regarding the manner of association of college enrollment size to differences in issue perception.

Influence of College District Geographic Location

The second inquiry of the third study question related to whether significant differences existed between the perceptions of critical issues of respondents based upon the north-south geographic location of the college districts.

Respondents were grouped by the location of their college district into four categories: (1) North--those from districts north of an east-west line through Lake Tahoe, (2) North Central--those from districts between east-west lines through Lake Tahoe and Monterey Bay, (3) South Central--those from districts located between east-west lines through Monterey Bay and the Tehachapi Mountains, and (4) South--those from colleges south of an east-west line through the Tehachapi Mountains. The number of respondents in the four categories were, respectively: (1) 14, (2) 111, (3) 33, and (4) 143.

Table 18

Differences in Issue Perception Between Respondents in Paired College Enrollment Groups Exceeding 0.5 Scale Unit and Significant at 0.05

Issue Category	Issue Description	Differences Between Group Mean Response Scores --Taken in Order Shown: Under 6000- 6 to 12000	Under 6000- 12 to 18000	Under 6000- 18 to 36000	6 to 12000- 12 to 18000	6 to 12000- 18 to 36000	12 to 18000- 18 to 36000
Instruction	Educ'l. Follow-up Programs					.527*	
Governance	Faculty Senates				.749***		
	District-College Administration				.541*		

Note: Groups are identified by the size of Fall 1979 college total enrollments.
Statistical significance: * Significant at the .05 level.
*** Significant at the .001 level.

Table 19

Differences in Issue Perception Between Respondents in Paired Geographic Groups Exceeding 0.5 Scale Unit and Significant at 0.05

Issue Category	Issue Description	Differences Between Group Mean Response Scores --Taken in Order Shown: North- North Central	North- South Central	North- South	North Central- South Central	North Central- South	South Central- South
Governance	Interdistrict Stu. Flow						-.560*
Finance	Tuition				.648**		

Note: Statistical significance: * Significant at the .05 level. ** Significant at the .01 level.

Differences in the perceptions of delegates from the four geographic groups were analyzed by identifying issues for which two or more pairs of delegate groups showed mean response differences larger than 0.5 questionnaire scale interval with a statistical significance at or above the 0.05 probability level. Table 19 indicates the two such differences in perception which were noted.

Delegates from the South Central area perceived that Interdistrict Student Flow was less likely to become a critical issue than did delegates from the South area. Delegates from the South Central area also differed from delegates from the North Central area perceiving a smaller likelihood that Tuition would be a critical issue in the 1980's.

Again, some evidence was found that significant differences in perceptions of critical issues existed between respondents grouped by geographic location, but the small number of differences observed precluded any conclusions regarding the nature of the association of geographic location and issue perception.

Influence of Collective Bargaining Status and District Governance

The last two inquiries in the third study question related to what significant differences existed between the perceptions of critical issues of respondents based on: (1) whether their faculties operate under collective bargaining contracts, and (2) on whether their college districts are single campus or multicampus districts.

Respondents were grouped for the analysis of these two hypotheses, first, into two groups depending on whether their districts had collective bargaining contracts for faculty in the Fall of 1979 and, second, into two groups based on whether the college districts were single campus or multicampus districts in the Fall of 1979. Respondents from colleges with contracts numbered 169 and those from colleges without contracts, 132. Respondents from single campus districts numbered 136 and those from multicampus districts, 165.

Differences in the perceptions of delegates for both analyses were determined by identifying issues for which two or more pairs of delegate groups showed mean response differences larger than 0.5 questionnaire scale interval with a statistical significance at or above the 0.05 probability level.

No such significant differences in perception of issues were observed for either delegate grouping.

Results Summary

The study involved the development of a rank ordered listing of issues likely to be critical to the California community colleges in the 1980's and a comparison of the perceptions of respondents grouped in various ways.

The population investigated was the 484-member CCJCA Delegate Assembly and a response from 62 percent of the delegates was received.

Of the 56 issues offered for appraisal the following 15 issues, shown in rank order, were perceived by the delegates grouped together as representing those most likely to be critical in the 1980's: State Level Roles; Tuition; Finance Parameters; Adult Basic Skills Education; Collective Bargaining; Reduction in Force Procedures; Student Retention; Enrollment Predictions; Developmental Education; Equalization of Faculty Salaries; Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student; Interdistrict Student Flow; Part-Time Faculty; Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges, and Community Colleges; and Staff Performance Evaluation.

Delegates grouped by their identities as trustee, administrator, faculty, or student were found to have somewhat different perceptions on critical issues. Thirty-four substantively and statistically significant differences in questionnaire response means were observed between pairs of delegate groups on various issues. The greatest number of such differences were noted between administrators and students with a lesser but substantial number of differences between trustee-administrator and trustee-student group pairs.

Students were found to place more emphasis on student government and student medical services and less emphasis on employer-employee issues than did the other three groups. Administrators, however, placed greater emphasis on managerial issues than did other delegate groups.

Analysis of the issue categories which delegate groups favored in their first priority issues showed that trustees and administrators emphasized the categories Staff and Finance, faculty emphasized Mission and Finance, and students emphasized Mission, Staff, and Finance.

Examination of the ten issues seen as most critical by the four delegate groups indicated that five issues: State Level Roles, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, Collective Bargaining, and Reduction in Force Procedures were issues common to the trustee, administrator and faculty lists. Students agreed with the first three of these issues but emphasized four other issues: Articulation with 4-Year Colleges, Flexible Calendar, Staff Performance Evaluation, and Traditional Roles, which were not noted among the first ten issues of any of the other three groups.

Analysis of responses from delegates grouped by college enrollment identified two group pairings with three issues showing significant differences in perception.

Analysis of responses from delegates grouped by district location identified two group pairings with two issues showing significant differences in perception.

No significant differences in perception were observed for delegates grouped either by the existence of a faculty collective bargaining contract or by the form of district governance, single or multicampus.

A comparison of issues reported as critical in 1965 in the Peterson study and in 1979 in this study showed the following as the five most crucial issues for each period, in rank order:

	Peterson Study	Current Study
1.	Effectiveness & improvement of instruction	State level roles
2.	Promotion & dissemination of junior college research & development	Tuition
3.	Dropouts	Finance parameters
4.	Evaluation of instructional offerings	Adult basic skills education
5.	Financial support	Collective bargaining

A general comparison of the results of the Peterson study with the results of this investigation indicated that in the 14 year period from 1965 to 1979, issues related to Finance and Mission have increased in importance and issues related to Student Services and Curriculum have decreased in importance.

A final conclusion drawn from both studies is that the body of issues critical to the California community colleges is an evolving entity in which some issues continue to be of importance indefinitely, in which new issues develop in response to legislative, societal, or economic pressures, and that this body of critical issues, in keeping with an increasingly complex community college role and environment, is increasing in number and complexity.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the study findings:

1. In the view of community college staff and students, the 15 issues most likely to be critical for the California public community colleges in the 1980's were, in order of importance: State Level Roles, Tuition, Finance Parameters, Adult Basic Skills Education, Collective Bargaining, Reduction in Force Procedures, Student Retention, Enrollment Predictions, Developmental Education, Equalization of Faculty Salaries, Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student, Interdistrict Student Flow, Part-Time Faculty, Channeling of High School Graduates, and Staff Performance Evaluation.

2. For community college staff and students taken together the two issue areas most likely to be crucial in the 1980's were Staff and Finance.

3. Community college staff--trustees, administrators and faculty--had similar perceptions regarding the most critical issues and emphasized issues in the areas of Staff and Finance.

4. Community college students, while in partial agreement with community college staff regarding issues, tended to identify as crucial more issues related to educational delivery and to student services.

5. The influences of college enrollment size and of geographic location on delegates' views of issues were documentable but slight.

6. The influences of faculty collective bargaining status and of the district governance form had no significant effect on delegates' views of issues.

7. Critical community college issues determined in this study were substantially different from issues determined by Peterson 14 years earlier with a general shift of importance from the areas of Student Services and Curriculum to those of Finance and Mission.

Recommendations

The original significance of this study lay in the need of the California community colleges and their related State-level agencies to be able to identify critical issues in advance so that appropriate and timely investigations could be made. Several recommendations can be drawn from the findings and conclusions of this study relative to that need.

1. Drawing from the 15 issues seen as most critical by the CCJCA delegates, the California Postsecondary Education Commission should undertake an investigation of the future impact of one issue which will affect California postsecondary education generally:

   (a) Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges and Community Colleges - Determine, in the event of reduced numbers of high school graduates in the 1980's, the best scheme for division of such students between the three segments of public postsecondary education in California.

2. Drawing from the 15 issues seen as most critical by the CCJCA delegates, the Board of Governors of California community colleges should undertake an investigation of the future impact of eight issues with major influence on the California community colleges taken collectively:

   (a) State Level Roles - Resolve the appropriate division of responsibilities between the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the State Department of Finance, the State Board of Governors, and the local Governing Boards in the governance of the community colleges.

   (b) Tuition - Consider the advantages and disadvantages of some form of student tuition for future community college support.

   (c) Finance Parameters - Determine the likely effects of State funding which key apportionments to measured volumes of student support services as well as instructional services and to student credit hours rather than contact hours.

   (d) Adult Basic Skills Education - Reassess the current division of responsibilities between the community colleges and the high schools in teaching basic adult survival skills to better define community college responsibilities.

   (e) Enrollment Predictions - Evaluate predictions of reduced numbers of traditional, young community college students in the 1980's in terms of the impact of these predictions on needed staff and facilities in the future and on the community college clientele in the 1980's.

   (f) Equalization of Faculty Salaries - Assess the effects of a Statewide faculty salary schedule as a possible result of departing from property tax financing.

   (g) Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student - Assess the effects of a leveling of educational expenditures per student among the colleges as a possible result of reduced support from property taxes.

   (h) Interdistrict Student Flow - Analyze the permit, free flow and "nearest college" options in controlling interdistrict student flows to determine which system acts best to meet both student and college needs.

3. Drawing from the 15 issues seen as most critical by the CCJCA delegates, the California community college districts, operating individually or jointly through CCJCA, should undertake investigations of the future impacts of six issues with major influence on the community colleges taken individually:

   (a) Collective Bargaining - Determine the effects of collective bargaining in the community colleges and consider desired changes in its scope or operation.

   (b) Reduction in Force Procedures - Clarify current state and local policies dealing with reducing staff under conditions of diminished funding or enrollments and consider their long term effects on campus and staff.

(c) Student Retention - Evaluate current programs aimed at improving student retention and consider the desirability of expanding and improving these activities.

(d) Developmental Education - Determine the appropriate emphasis on basic reading, writing and mathematical instruction in the overall community college program.

(e) Part-Time Faculty - Reassess the role of part-time faculty, determine their appropriate weight in collective bargaining issues and consider their appropriate compensation.

(f) Staff Performance Evaluation - Evaluate the reality of staff evaluation systems in their differentiating efficient and inefficient performance and consider any needed revisions of current practice.

4. The California community college districts, operating individually or jointly through CCJCA, should undertake investigations of student attitudes toward three issues, perceived as critical by students, but not included in the first 15 issues identified as critical by the delegate groups jointly.

(a) Articulation with Four-Year Colleges - Develop improved means of ensuring that the community college curriculum relates efficiently with that of neighboring four-year colleges.

(b) Flexible Calendar - Consider adoption of a flexible academic calendar allowing shorter instruction periods than the classical semester, flexible scheduling of educational programs, and completion of the first period before the Christmas break.

(c) Traditional Roles - Reassess the traditional community college roles of transfer education, general education and occupational education in terms of their relevance to today's community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

Peterson, B. H. Critical problems and needs of California junior colleges. Modesto, California: California Junior College Association, 1965. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 011449).

Weiss, R. S. Statistics in social research: An introduction, New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

Reference Notes

1. California Postsecondary Education Commission. Planning for postsecondary education in California: A five-year plan update, 1979. Unpublished report, January 1979.

2. Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. California community college five-year plan 1977 - 1982. Unpublished report, January 1977.

STUDY ADVISORY PANEL

Trustees:

John C. Anderson, Jr., Peralta College District
Lilyan Eldred, Monterey Peninsula College District
Eleanore D. Nettle, San Mateo County Community College District
Robert Prescott, Mira Costa College District

Administrators:

Ray A. Cattani, President, Reedley College
James S. Fitzgerald, President, Foothill College
David H. Mertes, President, Santa Barbara City College
Omar H. Scheidt, President, Palomar College

Faculty:

Norman P. Barth, Sacramento City College
Kay Grable, Santa Ana College
Elizabeth Otten, Southwestern College
Gary S. Resnick, Saddleback College
Mary Carter Smith, Laney College

Students:

Joyce Bartlett, College of Alameda
Don Tucker, El Camino College
Arlyn Turner, Mendocino College

SURVEY: COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES FOR THE EIGHTIES

Please rate the topics below on their chance of becoming critical issues for the California community colleges in the 1980's. Circle one of the numbers opposite each topic to indicate your selection.

Critical issues are meant to include questions which will be subjects of decisive discussion in State-level educational forums -- the Legislature, the Postsecondary Education Commission, the Board of Governors, the State Academic Senate, CCJCA itself -- and which suggest major change in the goal, function or practice of the California community colleges. Critical issues are also meant to include issues which, while not crucial at the State level, are felt to embody the need for important and substantial change at the local level by at least one category of the CCJCA Delegate Assembly.

	Chance of topic being a critical issue in the 1980's				
	Negligible	Small	Moderate	Good	Excellent
MISSION					
1. Community Services - Examine the colleges' current role as community cultural centers with programs in art, music and drama, and determine whether this role should be expanded or diminished.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Adult Basic Skills Education - Reassess the current division of responsibilities between the community colleges and the high schools in teaching basic adult survival skills to better define community college responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Traditional Roles - Reassess the traditional community college roles of transfer education, general education and occupational education in terms of their relevance to today's community.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Multi-Cultural, Multi-Lingual Education - Examine the current involvement in multi-cultural, multi-lingual education in terms of optimal meeting of of community needs.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Developmental Education - Determine the appropriate emphasis on basic reading, writing and mathematical instruction in the overall community college program.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Handicapped Students - Examine the current commitment to the education of handicapped students in terms of meeting community needs and effectively fulfilling the colleges' general mission.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Instruction, Student Services Roles - Examine the allocation of resources between the two major community college activities - Instruction and Student Services - and consider the appropriateness of current practice.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Personal Enrichment Education - Examine community needs for non-credit, personal enrichment classes and the means, tuition or otherwise, of funding such classes.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Intercollegiate Athletics - Assess the appropriate role and funding emphasis of intercollegiate athletic programs in the community college.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Open-Door Admissions - Evaluate the traditional policy of acceptance of any resident, 18 years of age or older, without reference to previous educational program or previous educational success.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges and Community Colleges - Determine, in the event of reduced numbers of high school graduates in the 1980's, the best scheme for division of such students between the three segments of public postsecondary education in California.	1	2	3	4	5
INSTRUCTION					
1. Enrollment Predictions - Evaluate predictions of reduced numbers of traditional, young community college students in the 1980's in terms of the impact of these predictions on needed staff and facilities in the future and on the community college clientele in the eighties.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Self-Paced Learning - Promote instructional innovation allowing individual students to progress at rates indicated by their own abilities and levels of interest.	1	2	3	4	5

	Chance of topic being a critical issue in the 1980's				
	Negligible	Small	Moderate	Good	Excellent
INSTRUCTION (Cont'd.)					
3. Associate of Arts, Sciences Degrees - Reexamine the educational content of the Associate of Arts and Associate of Sciences degrees to assess their significance as post-secondary degrees and as substantial educational experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
4. New Educational Delivery Systems - Expand the use of newer systems of educational delivery including television, the newspaper, and storefront satellite centers.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Grading Practice - Investigate current trends toward grade inflation and work toward a more uniform instructor interpretation of the individual letter grades.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Educational Follow-Up Programs - Develop means of following transfer, general education, and occupational students after departure from the college to determine the impact of their community college experience.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Flexible Calendar - Consider adoption of a flexible academic calendar allowing shorter instruction periods than the classical semester, flexible scheduling of educational programs, and completion of the first period before the Christmas break.	1	2	3	4	5
STUDENT SERVICES					
1. Job Placement Programs - Evaluate the community college job placement program to determine the allocation of effort between location of part-time jobs while in school and location of full-time jobs after graduation, and the success of the program in meeting both goals.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Student Government - Determine the degree to which student governments meet the needs and interests of a student clientele of widely varying ages and backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Counseling Program - Examine the allocation of staff time between academic, occupational and personal counseling and consider any needed shifts in emphasis.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Registration - Evaluate current registration procedures to optimize the process in terms of minimized student registration time, minimized repetitive data collection, and minimized post-registration class crashing.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Student Medical Services - Examine the typical level of medical services available to community college students and measure their adequacy and appropriateness.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Evening Student Services - Evaluate the extent to which counseling and financial aid assistance are offered in the evening and the need for expansion of these services in the evening program.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Outreach and Recruitment - Evaluate current outreach and recruitment programs and consider whether these activities should be changed in the present period of falling enrollment.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Student Retention - Evaluate current programs aimed at improving student retention and consider the desirability of expanding and improving these activities.	1	2	3	4	5
CURRICULUM					
1. Articulation with Four-Year Colleges - Develop improved means of ensuring that the community college curriculum relates efficiently with that of neighboring four-year colleges.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Afternoon, Evening Programs - Assess community needs for a broader spectrum of classes in the afternoon and evening hours.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Program Evaluation - Develop a system of program evaluation which assures that educational programs fulfill needed goals when instituted and continue to fulfill these goals in succeeding years.	1	2	3	4	5

	Chance of topic being a critical issue in the 1980's				
	Negligible	Small	Moderate	Good	Excellent
CURRICULUM (Cont'd.)					
4. Educational Master Plans - Develop long-term, educational master plans which channel curricular development into directions which fulfill defined college goals.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Requirements for Credit Classification - Analyze the increasingly restrictive requirements for credit classification of community college programs to determine a set of definitions which best deals with the community college mission and its clientele.	1	2	3	4	5
STAFF					
1. Faculty Load - Evaluate current systems for defining community college faculty load and determine the fairness and effectiveness of these systems.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Collective Bargaining - Determine the effects of collective bargaining in the community colleges and consider desired changes in its scope or operation.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Staff Performance Evaluation - Evaluate the reality of staff evaluation systems in their differentiating efficient and inefficient performance and consider any needed revisions of current practice.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Part-Time Faculty - Reassess the role of part-time faculty, determine their appropriate weight in collective bargaining issues and consider their appropriate compensation.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Affirmative Action - Evaluate typical affirmative action programs, the dimensions of the problems they address, and their current success in dealing with these problems.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Staff Development - Investigate the extent of effective staff development programs within the community colleges and the possible advantages of expanding such opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Reduction in Force Procedures - Clarify current state and local policies dealing with reducing staff under conditions of diminished funding or enrollments and consider their long term effects on campus and staff.	1	2	3	4	5
FACILITIES					
1. Evening Facilities - Assess the need for expanded evening classroom facilities and the degree to which limited evening classroom space controls evening enrollments.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Recreational Facilities - Evaluate community needs for expanded access to community college recreational equipment and facilities on evenings and weekends.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Library Facilities - Measure the appropriateness of library facilities and funding in terms of availability of: broad, current library holdings; quiet study areas; and adequate audio-visual facilities.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Transportation and Parking - Evaluate peak transportation problems to determine the need for improvements in: public transportation, freeway and highway access, and parking and traffic design.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Instructional Facilities - Evaluate current classrooms, laboratories and shops for their effectiveness and adaptability and investigate ways of providing improved facilities.	1	2	3	4	5

	Chance of topic being a critical issue in the 1980's				
	Negligible	Small	Moderate	Good	Excellent
GOVERNANCE					
1. State Level Roles - Resolve the appropriate division of responsibilities between the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the State Department of Finance, the State Board of Governors, and the local Governing Boards in the governance of the community colleges.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Faculty Senates - Reexamine the role of Faculty Senates to determine their proper role in cooperative college governance within the present collective bargaining environment.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Accreditation - Evaluate present accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to determine the utility of and possible alternatives to this method of evaluation.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Community College Education Code - Evaluate the importance to the community colleges of a revision of the State Educational Code from a strict, definitional document to a more permissive document.	1	2	3	4	5
5. District-College Administration - Study current forms of district and college administrative organization in terms of efficiency and responsiveness and consider any desired changes.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Interdistrict Student Flow - Analyze the permit, free flow and "nearest college" options in controlling interdistrict student flows to determine which system acts best to meet both student and college needs.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Public Employment Relations Board - Evaluate the operation of the PERB in its regulation of educational collective bargdining and determine any need for modification of its role or procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
FINANCE					
1. Equalization of Faculty Salaries - Assess the effects of a Statewide faculty salary schedule as a possible result of departing from property tax financing.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Control of Campus Construction - Examine the present system of control of construction funds by the Chancellor's Office and consider modifications of this system for future needs.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Categorical Funded Programs - Examine the extent of categorically funded community college programs and the degree to which such programs fulfill or distort the colleges' primary mission.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Finance Parameters - Determine the likely effects of State funding systems which key apportionments to measured volumes of student support services as well as instructional services and to student credit hours rather than contact hours.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Equalization of Instructional Costs Per Student - Assess the effects of a leveling of educational expenditures per student among the colleges as a possible result of reduced support from property taxes.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Tuition - Consider the advantages and disadvantages of some form of student tuition for future community college support.	1	2	3	4	5

Critical Issue
Mean Response Scores
by Questionnaire Issue Category
for Each Delegate Group and For All Delegate Groups Combined

Issue Category	Issue Item	Delegate Groups Combined	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students
MISSION	MIS 01	3.524	3.394	3.637	3.435	3.628
	MIS 02	4.109	4.090	4.333	4.198	3.814
	MIS 03	3.681	3.478	3.500	3.931	3.814
	MIS 04	3.193	3.076	3.347	3.115	3.233
	MIS 05	3.916	3.612	4.196	4.136	3.721
	MIS 06	3.358	3.273	3.569	3.126	3.465
	MIS 07	3.470	3.288	3.686	3.233	3.674
	MIS 08	3.613	3.677	3.693	3.523	3.558
	MIS 09	3.241	3.409	3.471	3.059	3.024
	MIS 10	3.352	3.242	3.485	3.425	3.256
	MIS 11	3.744	3.545	3.921	4.092	3.419
INSTRUCTION	INS 01	3.941	3.892	4.127	4.000	3.744
	INS 02	3.006	3.149	3.255	2.875	2.744
	INS 03	3.026	2.881	2.853	3.136	3.233
	INS 04	3.325	3.397	3.431	3.138	3.333
	INS 05	3.347	3.194	3.549	3.341	3.302
	INS 06	3.271	3.090	3.657	3.080	3.256
	INS 07	3.552	3.147	3.471	3.682	3.907
STUDENT SERVICES	STU 01	3.198	3.106	3.245	2.954	3.488
	STU 02	2.648	2.597	2.441	2.322	3.233
	STU 03	3.434	3.179	3.471	3.575	3.512
	STU 04	3.012	3.074	3.010	2.779	3.186
	STU 05	2.544	2.507	2.392	2.184	3.093

Critical Issue Mean Response Scores by Questionnaire Issue Category for Each Delegate Group and For All Delegate Groups Combined

Issue Category	Issue Item	Delegate Groups Combined	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students
STUDENT SERVICES	STU 06	3.187	3.179	3.069	3.034	3.465
	STU 07	3.577	3.373	3.713	3.523	3.698
	STU 08	3.961	3.716	4.363	3.955	3.810
CURRICULUM	CUR 01	3.721	3.373	3.598	3.841	4.071
	CUR 02	3.353	3.299	3.324	3.477	3.310
	CUR 03	3.625	3.612	3.794	3.545	3.548
	CUR 04	3.442	3.194	3.772	3.253	3.548
	CUR 05	3.638	3.446	3.752	3.686	3.667
STAFF	STA 01	3.694	3.833	3.970	3.670	3.302
	STA 02	4.070	4.262	4.267	4.011	3.738
	STA 03	3.738	3.703	3.802	3.586	3.860
	STA 04	3.779	3.889	4.079	3.659	3.488
	STA 05	3.281	3.215	3.446	3.068	3.395
	STA 06	3.141	3.197	3.436	2.955	2.976
	STA 07	4.027	3.955	4.356	4.057	3.738
FACILITIES	FAC 01	3.032	2.955	3.089	2.943	3.140
	FAC 02	2.688	2.827	2.723	2.391	2.810
	FAC 03	2.811	2.621	2.713	2.724	3.186
	FAC 04	2.873	3.106	2.861	2.500	3.023
	FAC 05	3.085	3.061	3.208	2.839	3.233
GOVERNANCE	GOV 01	4.453	4.453	4.770	4.465	4.125
	GOV 02	3.499	3.403	3.750	3.581	3.262
	GOV 03	3.022	2.903	3.170	2.753	3.262

Critical Issue Mean Response Scores by Questionnaire Issue Category for Each Delegate Group and For All Delegate Groups Combined

Issue Category	Issue Item	Delegate Groups Combined	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students
GOVERNANCE	GOV 04	3.513	3.548	3.600	3.214	3.690
	GOV 05	3.362	3.250	3.350	3.471	3.375
	GOV 06	3.849	3.797	4.130	3.565	3.902
	GOV 07	3.461	3.667	3.850	3.553	2.775
FINANCE	FIN 01	3.897	3.703	4.250	4.000	3.634
	FIN 02	3.506	3.500	3.790	3.442	3.293
	FIN 03	3.708	3.719	3.800	3.671	3.643
	FIN 04	4.113	3.841	4.440	4.048	4.122
	FIN 05	3.887	3.524	4.320	3.884	3.821
	FIN 06	4.219	4.344	4.110	4.128	4.476

Critical Issues
Rank Ordered by
Individual Delegate Groups
and By All Delegate Groups Combined
Respondent Category

Rank	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Combined Delegate Groups
1.	State Level Roles (GOV 01)	State Level Roles (GOV 01)	State Level Roles (GOV 01)	Tuition (FIN 06)	State Level Roles (GOV 01)
2.	Tuition (FIN 06)	Finance Parameters (FIN 04)	Adult Basic Skills Education (MIS 02)	State Level Roles (GOV 01)	Tuition (FIN 06)
3.	Collective Bargaining (STA 02)	Student Retention (STU 08)	Developmental Education (MIS 05)	Finance Parameters (FIN 04)	Finance Parameters (FIN 04)
4.	Adult Basic Skills Education (MIS 02)	Reduction in Force Procedures (STA 07)	Tuition (FIN 06)	Articulation with Four-Year Colleges (CUR 01)	Adult Basic Skills Education (MIS 02)
5.	Reduction in Force Procedures (STA 07)	Adult Basic Skills Education (MIS 02)	Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges & Community Colleges (MIS 11)	Flexible Calendar (INS 07)	Collective Bargaining (STA 02)
6.	Enrollment Predictions (INS 01)	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student (FIN 05)	Reduction in Force Procedures (STA 07)	Interdistrict Student Flow (GOV 06)	Reduction in Force Procedures (STA 07)
7.	Part-Time Faculty (STA 04)	Collective Bargaining (STA 02)	Finance Parameters (FIN 04)	Staff Performance Evaluation (STA 03)	Student Retention (STU 08)
8.	Finance Parameters (FIN 04)	Equalization of Faculty Salaries (FIN 01)	Collective Bargaining (STA 02)	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student (FIN 05)	Enrollment Predictions (INS 01)
9.	Faculty Load (STA 01)	Developmental Education (MIS 05)	*Enrollment Predictions (INS 01) *Equalization of Faculty Salaries (FIN 01)	*Adult Basic Skills Education (MIS 02) *Traditional Roles (MIS 03)	Developmental Education (MIS 05)
10.	Interdistrict Student Flow (GOV 06)	Interdistrict Student Flow (GOV 06)			Equalization of Faculty Salaries (FIN 01)
11.	Categorical Funded Programs (FIN 03)	Enrollment Predictions (INS 01)	Student Retention, (STU 08)	Student Retention (STU 08)	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student (FIN 05)
12.	Student Retention (STU 08)	Tuition (FIN 06)	Traditional Roles (MIS 03)	Enrollment Predictions (INS 01)	Interdistrict Student Flow (GOV 06)
13.	*Staff Performance Evaluation (STA 03) *Equalization of Faculty Salaries (FIN 01)	Part-Time Faculty (STA 04)	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student (FIN 05)	*Collective Bargaining (STA 02) *Reduction in Force Procedures (STA 07)	Part-Time Faculty (STA 04)
14.		Faculty Load (STA 01)	Articulation with Four-Year Colleges (CUR 01)		Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges & Community Colleges (MIS 11)
15.	Personal Enrichment Education (MIS 08)	Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges & Community Colleges (MIS 11)	Requirements for Credit Classification (CUR 05)	Developmental Education (MIS 05)	Staff Performance Evaluation (STA 03)
16.	Public Employment Relations Board (GOV 07)	Public Employment Relations Board (GOV 07)	Flexible Calendar (INS 07)	Outreach & Recruitment (STU 07)	Articulation with Four-Year Colleges (CUR 01)

*Rank Order Ties.

Rank	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Combined Delegate Groups
17.	*Developmental Education (MIS 05) *Program Evaluation (CUR 03)	Staff Performance Evaluation (STA 03)	Categorical Funded Programs (FIN 03)	Community College Education Code (GOV 04)	Categorical Funded Programs (FIN 03)
18.		Categorical Funded Programs (FIN 03)	Faculty Load (STA 01)	Instruction, Student Services Roles (MIS 07)	Faculty Load (STA 01)
19.	Community College Education Code (GOV 04)	Program Evaluation (CUR 03)	Part-Time Faculty (STA 04)	Requirements for Credit Classifications (CUR 05)	Traditional Roles (MIS 03)
20.	Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges & Community Colleges (MIS 11)	Control of Campus Construction (FIN 02)	Staff Performance Evaluation (STA 03)	Categorical Funded Programs (FIN 03)	Requirements for Credit Classifications (CUR 05)
21.	Equalization of Instructional Costs per Student (FIN 05)	Educational Master Plans (CUR 04)	Faculty Senates (GOV 02)	Equalization of Faculty Salaries (FIN 01)	Program Evaluation (CUR 03)
22.	Control of Campus Construction (FIN 02)	Requirements for Credit Classifications (CUR 05)	Counseling Program (STU 03)	Community Services (MIS 01)	Personal Enrichment Education (MIS 08)
23.	Traditional Roles (MIS 03)	Faculty Senates (GOV 02)	Interdistrict Student Flow (GOV 06)	Personal Enrichment Education (MIS 08)	Outreach & Recruitment (STU 07)
24.	Requirements for Credit Classifications (CUR 05)	Outreach & Recruitment (STU 07)	Public Employees Relations Board (GOV 07)	*Program Evaluation (CUR 03) *Educational Master Plans (CUR 04)	Flexible Calendar (INS 07)
25.	Intercollegiate Athletics (MIS 09)	Personal Enrichment Education (MIS 08)	Program Evaluation (CUR 03)		Community Services (MIS 01)
26.	Faculty Senates (GOV 02)	Instruction, Student Services Roles (MIS 07)	*Personal Enrichment Education (MIS 08) *Outreach & Recruitment (STU 07)	Counseling Program (STU 03)	Community College Education Code (GOV 04)
27.	New Educational Delivery Systems (INS 04)	Educational Follow-up Programs (INS 06)		*Job Placement Programs (STU 01) *Part-Time Faculty (STA 04)	Control of Campus Construction (FIN 02)
28.	Community Services (MIS 01)	Community Services (MIS 01)	Afternoon, Evening Programs (CUR 02)		Faculty Senates (GOV 02)
29.	*Outreach & Recruitment (STU 07) *Articulation with Four-Year Colleges (CUR 01)	Community College Education Code (GOV 04)	District-College Administration (GOV 05)	*Handicapped Students (MIS 06) *Evening Student Services (STU 06)	Instruction, Student Services Roles (MIS 07)
30.		Articulation with Four-Year Colleges (CUR 01)	Control of Campus Construction (FIN 02)		Public Employment Relations Board (GOV 07)
31.	Afternoon, Evening Programs (CUR 02)	Handicapped Students (MIS 06)	Community Services (MIS 01)	Channeling of High School Graduates to Universities, State Colleges & Community Colleges (MIS 11)	Educational Master Plans (CUR 04)
32.	Instruction, Student Services Roles (MIS 07)	Grading Practice (INS 05)	Open-Door Admissions (MIS 10)	Affirmative Action (STA 05)	Counseling Program (STU 03)
33.	Handicapped Students (MIS 06)	Traditional Roles (MIS 03)	Grading Practice (INS 05)	District-College Administration (GOV 05)	District-College Administration (GOV 05)

Rank	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Combined Delegate Groups
34.	District-College Administration (GOV 05)	Open-Door Admissions (MIS 10)	Educational Master Plans (CUR 04)	New Educational Delivery Systems (INS 04)	Handicapped Students (MIS 06)
35.	Open-Door Admissions (MIS 10)	*Intercollegiate Athletics (MIS 09) *Flexible Calendar (INS 07) *Counseling Program (STU 03)	Instruction, Student Services Roles (MIS 07)	Afternoon, Evening Programs (CUR 02)	Afternoon, Evening Programs (CUR 02)
36.	Affirmative Action (STA 05)		Community College Education Code (GOV 04)	*Grading Practice (INS 05) *Faculty Load (STA 01)	Open-Door Admissions (MIS 10)
37.	Staff Development (STA 06)		New Educational Delivery Systems (INS 04)		Grading Practice (INS 05)
38.	*Grading Practice (INS 05) *Educational Master Plans (CUR 04)	Affirmative Action (STA 05)	Associate of Arts, Sciences, Degrees (INS 03)	Control of Campus Construction (FIN 02)	New Educational Delivery Systems (INS 04)
39.		Staff Development (STA 06)	Handicapped Students (MIS 06)	*Faculty Senates (GOV 02) *Accreditation (GOV 03)	Affirmative Action (STA 05)
40.	*Counseling Program (STU 03) *Evening Student Services (STU 06)	New Educational Delivery Systems (INS 04)	Multi-Cultural, & Lingual Education (MIS 04)		Educational Follow-up Programs (INS 06)
41.		District-College Administration (GOV 05)	Educational Follow-up Programs (INS 06)	*Open-Door Admissions (MIS 10) *Educational Follow-up Programs (INS 06)	Intercollegiate Athletics (MIS 09)
42.	Self-Paced Learning (INS 02)	Multi-Cultural & Lingual Education (MIS 04)	Affirmative Action (STA 05)		Job Placement Programs (STU 01)
43.	Flexible Calendar (INS 07)	Afternoon, Evening Programs (CUR 02)	Intercollegiate Athletics (MIS 09)	*Multi-Cultural & Lingual Education (MIS 04) *AA, AS Degrees (INS 03) *Student Government (STU 02) *Instructional Facilities (FAC 05)	Multi-Cultural, Multi-Lingual Education (MIS 04)
44.	*Job Placement Programs (STU 01) *Transportation & Parking (FAC 04)	Self-Paced Learning (INS 02)	Evening Student Services (STU 06)		Evening Student Services (STU 06)
45.		Job Placement Programs (STU 01)	Staff Development (STA 06)		Staff Development (STA 06)
46.	Educational Follow-up Programs (INS 06)	Instructional Facilities (FAC 05)	Job Placement Programs (STU 01)		Instructional Facilities (FAC 05)
47.	Multi-Cultural, Multi-Lingual Education (MIS 04)	Accreditation (GOV 03)	Evening Facilities (FAC 01)	*Registration (STU 04) *Library Facilities (FAC 03)	Evening Facilities (FAC 01)
48.	Registration (STU 04)	Evening Facilities (FAC 01)	Self-Paced Learning (INS 02)		Associate of Arts, Sciences Degrees (INS 03)

Rank	Trustees	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Combined Delegate Groups
49.	Instructional Facilities (FAC 05)	Evening Student Services (STU 06)	Instructional Facilities (FAC 05)	Evening Facilities (FAC 01)	Accreditation (GOV 03)
50.	Evening Facilities (FAC 01)	Registration (STU 04)	Registration (STU 04)	Student Medical Services (STU 05)	Registration (STU 04)
51.	Accreditation (GOV 03)	Transportation & Parking (FAC 04)	Accreditation (GOV 03)	Intercollegiate Athletics (MIS 09)	Self-Paced Learning (INS 02)
52.	Associate of Arts, Sciences, Degrees (INS 03)	Associate of Arts, Sciences, Degrees (INS 03)	Library Facilities (FAC 03)	Transportation & Parking (FAC 04)	Transportation & Parking (FAC 04)
53.	Recreational Facilities (FAC 02)	Recreational Facilities (FAC 02)	Transportation & Parking (FAC 04)	Staff Development (STA 06)	Library Facilities (FAC 03)
54.	Library Facilities (FAC 03)	Library Facilities (FAC 03)	Recreational Facilities (FAC 02)	Recreational Facilities (FAC 02)	Recreational Facilities (FAC 02)
55.	Student Government (STU 02)	Student Government (STU 02)	Student Government (STU 02)	Public Employment Relations Board (GOV 07)	Student Government (STU 02)
56.	Student Medical Services (STU 05)	Student Medical Services (STU 05)	Student Medical Services (STU 05)	Self-Paced Learning (INS 02)	Student Medical Services (STU 05)

*Rank Order Ties.

CRITICAL ISSUES FOR THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE 1980'S

A Response to the Major Paper

Delivered to the

California Community and Junior College Association

Fall Meeting

Los Angeles, California

November 10, 1980

by

Clive L. Grafton

University of Southern California

An initial component of this discussion must include a compliment to the investigator. Dr. Rose has certainly brought a new approach to viewing those issues that face community colleges in the next decade. It is a recognition, I believe, that there is no constituency of the community college that does not have some perception of that institution's role. We have tended to narrowly test comparisons of perceptions on most educational problems in a rather narrow manner. The results have often been a distortion of what we are all about, rather than the more concise picture that we have sought. In bringing together views from a variety of respondents that have then allowed for a greater analysis than has ever been possible before, the study has a significant impact as a model and as a base for additional research and exploration.

I, like others, will be particularly interested in the directions that this organization (and perhaps some others) will take with the basic data of the study. The comparative aspects of Dr. Rose's study does emphasize at least one caveat: That times have moved swiftly in the last 15 years since the Peterson study. There is no indication that the next 15 years will not see the same level of acceleration. Hence, the interpretation of another decade may be totally distant from the truths that have emerged from this study. Obviously, we are in a time of some significant change --- politically, economically, socially. There is little doubt that in the realm of postsecondary education, the community college will be most deeply at the core of this transition. Still, the "Rose Study" seems to hint at some intriguing points that are worthy of intense attention:

1. One of the largest surprises in the study seems to be the relatively low ranking of curricular issues. Obviously, the changing pattern of state involvement and the similar changes

involved with financial support have taken on a significant new meaning. Curricular impact seems to me to be underrated by respondents and I would suggest represents an issue that has almost been buried by other circumstances. Ultimately, it would be my observation that this could well be the major issue in another decade.

2. There certainly seems to be an immediacy to the issues of the study. These are "right now" problems. There is not a single of these issues that do not warrant in-depth attention, some of which are already receiving this attention. It is the changing relationship and nature of these issues that most deeply concern me. At what level will the shifting patterns of issues be studied? Who will analyze them? At what level? Where will the research be that will give us hints into our future? I am concerned about the diminishing role of research as a major tool in working with our tomorrows.
3. I am impressed with the high levels of congruence that appear among the perceptions. This gives me pause to think that the community colleges are beginning to develop within its constituencies, a more consistent view of the major issues. This does not mean that the issues will be addressed by each constituency on an eye-to-eye basis, but it does mean that agreement has developed on what issues need to be addressed. This is an important accomplishment.
4. From a research viewpoint, the statistically insignificant results that occurred among size of community colleges, geographical location, and status of collective bargaining, was important. It tells us that there is even a greater congruence of perception than just that between the respondent groups. Another shred of evidence to indicate a greater closeness in viewpoint.

5. Lastly, I was most interested in how the "Rose Study" compared with other regional or national studies that addressed issues among community colleges. Some observations:

   a. CPEC's 1979 study developed a list of 19 issues. In their top 19 issues, only 11 of the current study issues show up. The item that was first in the "Rose Study" appears as a distantly related 14th in the CPEC study. But the CPEC study was a combination of perceptions held by other members of California's postsecondary representatives, notably the UC and CSUC systems. It appears that among all of the issues in California higher education, there is not a great deal of congruence. This needs to be investigated.

   b. When our good friend B. Lamar Johnson surveyed informally, some leaders of various American community colleges in 1977 & 1978, he ranked 10 issues. Surprisingly, only three of the "Rose Study" issues appear on this list. What appears to be an interesting possibility is the uniqueness of the California situation. Certainly this is true in many aspects of both control and finance.

   c. This same situation appears in a comparison with the 1979 study in Tennessee, where five of the "Rose Study" issues appear among the top 10.

I mention these comparisons only because of the growing interest of the community college in its national role. The other studies tended to have respondents drawn from mostly senior administrative levels, leaving out respondents that appear in the "Rose Study." That is what makes the current

effort so important. We have some issues of significant congruence. It should tell us a lot. It should tell us a lot about what we should be addressing. That's important!

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

MAR 6 1981